

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and Decision Record

SWIFTWATER FIELD OFFICE EA OR-104-02-10

Tioga Segment Reconstruction (North Umpqua Trail)

An interdisciplinary (ID) team of the Swiftwater Resource Area, Roseburg District, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has analyzed the proposed **Tioga Segment Reconstruction (North Umpqua Trail)** project. This analysis was documented in EA # OR-104-02-10. In the proposed action, the remaining unimproved portion of the **Tioga Segment Reconstruction**, located in Sections 1 & 12; T26S, R3W, W.M., would be reconstructed using a variety of equipment types ranging from ATV and trailer, motorized wheelbarrow and mini-excavator to chainsaws, wheelbarrows, and other hand tools. The trail reconstruction would begin at the Deadline Falls trail junction and continue to the trail junction leading to the Douglas County Park Swiftwater Pavilion (see EA # OR-104-02-10).

Decision:

It is my decision to authorize the implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative as described in the EA (pg. 2) and upgrade the remaining unimproved portion of the **Tioga Segment**.

Finding of No Significant Impacts:

I have reviewed the tests of significance as described in 40 CFR 1508.27 (see attached). Based on the site specific analysis summarized in the EA and noted above, it is my determination that the proposed action does not constitute a major federal action with significant impacts to the quality of the human environment therefore an Environmental Impact Statement does not need to be prepared. In accordance with the Standards and Guidelines (S&G's, pg. B-10), I find that "the proposed activity is consistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives" and "meets" or "does not prevent attainment" of these objectives.

Decision Rationale:

The Proposed Action Alternative meets the objectives for lands in the Riparian Reserve Land Use Allocations and follows the management actions/directions set forth in the *"Roseburg District Record of Decision and Resources Management Plan"* (RMP), and the Standards and Guidelines for the *"Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS) on Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old-Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl"* (Feb. 1994) and the Record of Decision (ROD) for that plan dated April 13, 1994.

The EA describes two alternatives: a "No Action" alternative and a "Proposed Action" alternative. The No Action alternative was not selected because it would not meet the purpose and need as identified in the EA. The EA did not identify any impacts of the Proposed Action that would be beyond those identified in the EIS.

The new site was evaluated in March 2002 and determined to have “No Effect” on the cultural resources.

Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for threatened or endangered (T&E) plants or terrestrial wildlife species was not required due to lack of presence (botany) or a no effect (northern spotted owl) determination.

Consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service for threatened or endangered aquatic species was not required due to a “No Effect” determination for the coho salmon or steelhead trout.

This decision recognizes that impacts will occur to resources, however, the impacts to resource values would not exceed those identified in the PRMP/EIS.

Comments were solicited from affected state and local government agencies. No comments were received during the thirty-day public review period.

Compliance and Monitoring:

Monitoring will be conducted as per the guidance given in the ROD and the RMP.

Appeal Procedures:

This decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, 1849 C Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20240. If an appeal is taken, notice of appeal must be filed in this office within 30 days after the legal notice announcing the availability of this Decision Record appears in *The News Review*. The appellant has the burden of showing that the decision appealed from is in error.

Jay K. Carlson, Field Manager
Swiftwater Field Office

Date

Tioga Segment Reconstruction (North Umpqua Trail)

Test for Significant Impacts. (40 CFR 1508.27)

1. Has impacts (both beneficial and adverse) determined to be severe? () Yes ☒ No
Remarks:
2. Has significant adverse impacts on public health or safety? () Yes ☒ No
Remarks: Considering the remoteness of the project to local population centers, and the design features governing the proposal (EA, pgs. 5 and 6), the likelihood of the project affecting public health and safety is remote and speculative.
3. Adversely affects such unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources, park, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains or ecologically significant or critical areas including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks? () Yes ☒ No
Remarks: Reviews (Cultural, Recreation, Wildlife, Hydrology and Fisheries) does not show that the proposed action would adversely affect any of the above characteristics.
4. Has highly controversial effects on the quality of the human environment? () Yes ☒ No
Remarks: Public responses received during the public comment period expressed a desire to minimize felling of trees. The project was designed to minimize the need to fell large trees. We find that this degree of controversy does not satisfy the threshold for the preparation of an EIS.
5. Has highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involves unique or unknown environmental risks? () Yes ☒ No
Remarks: The analysis does not indicate that this action would involve unique or unknown risks.
6. Establishes a precedent for future action or represents a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? () Yes ☒ No
Remarks: The modification of recreational sites is a well-established practice and does not establish a precedent for future actions.
7. Is directly related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? () Yes ☒ No
Remarks: We find that this action would not have a cumulatively significant impact on the environment beyond that already identified in the EIS.
8. Has adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places? () Yes ☒ No
Remarks: The EA shows that this action would not adversely affect any sites, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.
9. May adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973?

Aquatic Species	() Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Botanical Species	() Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Terrestrial Species	() Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Remarks: Consultation with NMFS was not required due to a "No Effect" determination for listed fish. Botanical surveys did not identify the presence of any T&E plants therefore consultation was not required. Consultation with the FWS was not required due to a "No Effect" determination for T&E terrestrial species.
10. Threatens to violate federal, state, local, or tribal law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment? () Yes ☒ No
Remarks: We find that this action would not threaten a violation of federal, state, local or tribal law imposed for the protection of the environment.